

The Genetive and Ablative of Description

by Edmund Dresser Cressman

June, 1911

Submitted to the Department of Latin and Greek
of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

Master Thesis

Cressman, E. D. 1911

(Latin)

The genetive and ablative
of description.



The Genitive and Ablative of Description

by

Edmund D. Cressman

A thesis submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts.

University of Kansas

June, 1911

Outline

	Page
Introductory	1.
Part I. Discussion and Criticism of Prevailing Theories	3.
1. Discussion and Criticism of Fundamental Differences	5.
A. Those based on a supposed difference of meaning	5.
B. Based on purely historical differences	6.
2. Discussion and Criticism of Detailed Statements	12.
3. Examples from Cicero and Tacitus	14.
Part II. Modifications of Hale's Theory Made Necessary by a Study of Early Latin	21.
1. List of Examples.	
Genitives of Description (excluding preti and modi)	21.
Ablatives of Description	22.
Genitives of Value	26.
Examples of Preti	29.
Examples of Modi	29.
2. Hale's Theory in the Light of these Examples	30.
3. Genitive of Value as Locative according to Roby, furnishing an addition to the sources given by Prof. Hale.	38.
4. Results	45.

The Genitive and Ablative of Description

--Introductory--

The investigation was begun with a view to finding out if possible, the fundamental difference between the genitive and the ablative of description, on the use of which the standard grammars so generally disagree. After an examination of the prevailing theories had been made in the light of about two hundred examples collected from various sources, later, also a collection taken from a part of the works of Cicero and Tacitus, and it had been found (in part I of this paper) that these theories failed to account for the facts, these same examples were used to try the validity of the theory offered by Prof. W. G. Hale. His explanation for the ablative was found to be satisfactory, as was also that for the genitive, as far as this list of examples was concerned. But his examples were taken from classical Latin; he himself holds that in such problems one should go back to the earlier Latin. Therefore the complete works of Plautus and Terence, and the De Re Rustica of Cato were examined, and a complete list of examples of these two constructions was obtained, to see if they bore out Prof. Hale's theory.

The results (Part II of this paper; p. ²¹~~12~~) showed a large number of ablatives of description, but a surprising dearth of genitives of description; and of these genitives

very few could be explained as originating in the sources which Prof. Hale gives. On the other hand, a very large number of genitives of value was found. Hale and most of the other grammarians give this construction as a development from the genitive of description; but the almost total absence of the latter construction in early Latin did not seem to justify this conclusion. Consequently, another explanation for the genitive of value was sought, and help was found in an article by Roby in the preface to his Latin grammar, Part II. This author, following Key, refers the (so-called) genitive of value to the locative. While there are objections to his treatment, they seem to be outweighed by stronger considerations. His reasons will be given and discussed. If this theory is correct, it takes the genitive of value from the place it occupies in nearly all the grammars, and suggests that this construction, also, as well as the explanatory and possessive genitives, was a source for the genitive of description.

Part I.

Discussion and Criticism of Prevailing Theories.

As a basis for later discussion, the works to be mentioned presently were examined with two chief objects in mind.

1. First to obtain and examine statements made in grammars and elsewhere with reference to the fundamental difference between the genitive and the ablative of description or quality. These were found capable of being grouped in two classes: A. Based on a supposed difference of meaning. B. Based on purely historical differences.

2. The second object was to examine the more detailed statements of the grammars as to the behavior of certain words or groups of words in these constructions, and see how far the examples went to prove their truth.

The list of examples used for this part of the paper (The complete list for early Latin being used later) includes 291 genitives and ablatives of description. It is admitted to be a miscellaneous and arbitrary list, and no pretense is made of completeness. These examples, instead of a more systematic list collected from some author, were used on account of the necessity of submitting the paper in support of my application for a fellowship elsewhere, earlier, in March 1911. A complete list of examples was

made (after Part II of this paper was written) from a part of the works of Cicero and Tacitus, to be mentioned later; but as they in no way changed the conclusions drawn from the former list, these conclusions were allowed to stand, and the second list is given at the end of Part I. The first list is sufficient to verify some of the grammatical rules and to show the need of a modification of others. A list of certain nouns and adjectives was obtained from various lexicons for the purpose of verifying some of the detailed statements concerning those words.

The American grammars examined are: Hale and Buck, Bennett (Revised), Lane (Revised), Allen and Greenough, Harkness, Gildersleeve and Lodge. The lexicons and other sources from which examples are taken are: Merguet's *Lexicon zu den Reden und Schriften des Cicero*, Meusel's *Lexicon Caesarianum*, Gerber and Greef's *Lexicon Tacitum*, Dräger's *Historische Syntax der Lateinischen Sprache*, Kühner's *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache*, Madvig's *Latin Grammar*, Roby's *Latin Grammar*, Mr. Geo. Edward's *Thesis on the Genitive and Ablative of Quality*, Wölfflin's *Archiv zu der Lateinischen Lexicographie*, Vol. 31 of *Transactions of the American Philological Association*.

1. Discussion and Criticism of Fundamental Differences.

As indicated above, the different theories advanced by the grammarians as to the difference between the use of the genitive and ablative may be conveniently placed under two main heads: A. Those based on a supposed difference in meaning. Of these there are three: (a) The first states that the genitive, being originally the case of possession expresses permanent characteristics, and the ablative transitory, (b) the second, that the genitive is used of essential, the ablative of special qualities, (c) the third that the genitive expresses internal, the ablative external qualities. On considering these theories we cannot fail to be surprised at the discrepancies existing between the grammars themselves as to these theories, and also the discrepancies between the theories and the examples.

A. (a) In the first place, the distinction of permanent and transitory qualities, championed by Bennett, did not hold, there being 11 different genitives of transitory, e.g., Hannibalis, annorum novem, Livy 21, 1, 4, and 19 ablatives of permanent qualities, e.g. C. Gracchus, clarissimo patre, Cat. 1. 2,. A few grammarians explain ablatives like bono animo, aequo animo, as designating mere passing traits, while the genitive magni animi denotes inborn character. Even if this were true for animus in

classical Latin it ought even more to be true back in early Latin. But we find it nearly always in the ablative, there being 16 ablatives and only 2 genitives, one of which is in a passage where the reading is doubtful. Ingenium, on the other hand, which always denotes lasting mental character is always in the ablative, with the exception of one genitive (*humani ingeni*) where the reading is doubtful and the construction is very close to the predicate genitive of possession. Genitives of both *animus* and *ingenium* occur in classical prose, the number of examples in Cicero (compiled from Merguet) being, *animi* 16, *animo* 75, *ingeni* 4, *ingenio* 33.

(b) The distinction between essential and special characteristics is apparently nearer being true, there being 15 genitives of special qualities, e.g. *redis mutatae frontis* Hor. Sat 2.8.84 and 5 ablatives of essential, e.g. *si sunt ingenio malo*, Merc. 967.

(c) There were 20 ablatives of internal e.g. *multifidant pari dignitate* Muren. 18, and 10 genitives of external characteristics, e.g. *maximi corporis homo*, Terps 14,3,1

B. Having now seen that the theories mentioned fail to account for many of the facts, let us consider the theory brought forward by Prof. Hale in an article of which an abstract is given in Vol. 31 of the proceedings of the

American Philological Association. Prof. Hale's article was written in answer to a thesis on this subject by Mr. Geo. Edwards. An abstract of this thesis is contained in Nos. XI, 2, and XI 4, of Wölfflin's Archiv. Mr. Edward's thesis was obtained and read, but for convenience Prof. Hale's summary of it is given here.

The summary as Prof. Hale gives it is as follows: "The underlying theory is the old one that the Genitive, as the case of possession, expresses permanent qualities, while the ablative, as the case of accompaniment, expresses passing and changing qualities. These proper distinctions are, however, more or less traversed by several other considerations (1) Partly historical. The ablative construction was the older. Hence the genitive construction comes in slowly even where it would be more suitable than the ablative, (2) Partly of form. The word *vis* is not employed in the genitive construction before the third century, since no genitive form was in use. The genitives of the fifth declension were avoided because of their ambiguity, though *spei* does come in with Caesar to express the idea of "promise" as distinct from that of "hope". For the same reason the genitive of *par* was avoided, and the genitive of adjectives in *--is* (3) Partly of sound. Combinations like *multarum causarum* were avoided on account

of the rhyme. (4) Partly of meter. Corpore fits into the fifth foot of the hexameter, and through its considerable use in this construction in Lucretius and Vergil, and imitation in poets of the Silver Age, remained commoner than corporis. (5) Partly of word meaning. In Plautus, animus expresses the changing mental attitude, in Cicero an abiding mental character. Hence the genitive is the proper case for Cicero though he does employ the ablative in a number of places where the Genitive would have fitted better. (6) Partly of the "subjective view" of the writer. Lucretius and Vergil conceived weight as a temporary quality, and therefore use the ablative of pondus. Caesar, and after him Livy, rightly conceived that weight was not an accident of matter and said magni ponderis, etc."

We saw that our examples failed to bear out the distinctions commonly made, and adopted by Mr. Edwards, of permanent and transitory qualities, etc. The reason for this is, Prof. Hale asserts, the fact that a quality in the genitive is the possessor, and not the thing possessed, and that there was nothing in the case itself which gave it the power of expressing lasting possession; secondly, if these two cases expressed by nature permanent or transitory qualities, the Romans would not have put both temp-

orary and permanent physical attributes in the ablative, as the examples show that they did. Again, Bennett explains the genitive of quality as a development from the genitive of possession, e.g. "magnae virtutis homo" was "virtue's man". This explanation is however, untenable, as it does not account for the necessity of the adjective, and it is vague, if not unreasonable, to speak of a man as belonging to a quality.

Hale's theory is that the genitive is a fusion, more or less complete, between the genitive of possession, in phrases like *eius generis*, *eius modi*, and the explanatory genitive, of which an example is "a delay of five days." The ablative is a fusion of the ablative of accompaniment, as seen with a preposition in "*cum illo animo*;" the separative ablative, seen with a preposition in "*ex eo genere*;" and the locative ablative, seen in the example "*in magna spe*."

The ablative of accompaniment (this term used in its wider sociative sense) was the oldest way of expressing a quality, e.g., "*magna virtute homo*." The possessive idea would here be impossible. Then, after analogy with genitives of possession like "*eius generis*" the case developed a descriptive power, and general nouns meaning kind, class etc., came to be used also in the genitive.

If it be assumed that the sources of the construction

were those just given, the remaining facts and limitations of the construction can easily be accounted for. Genus is found a few times in the ablative, when it would be expected to be in the genitive. The confusion that arose is not surprising, because the two meanings which the noun has, namely "kind" and "race" or "family" are not always distinct. *Eius modi* remained in the genitive because of its extreme commonness, also because *eo modo* took on an adverbial force.

With numerals the genitive remained the only possible case, being originally the case of more exact definition. To say "a ditch with three feet" would be impossible.

Words denoting parts of the body were originally used only in the idea of accompaniment, e.g., "a man with a big nose" not "belonging to a big nose". For this reason *facies* and *species* are in the ablative, not because they are of the 5th declension. On the other hand *statura*, *forma*, *corpus* tend to suggest the idea of measure, or kind, and are sometimes in the genitive, sometimes in the ablative.

These origins account also for the necessary modifier. We want to know to what class a man belongs; what kind of a nose he has; how many feet there are in the ditch.

Let us see again, how far the examples go to verify these assumptions. Out of a total of 181 ablatives, 140

were plainly accompaniment, as this term was defined; 9 were separative, and 3 were locative. Five (all genere) would naturally have been expected to be in the genitive. The remainder included words like *statura*, *forma*, *corpus*, *albedo*, *magnitudo*, of which the ablative is not so plainly accompaniment, and of which the genitive also is found.

Out of 110 genitives, 51 were plainly possessive, 8 explanatory. The remainder, about 51, included those words that would naturally have been in the ablative, also those which it was almost impossible to place, or to say whether they expressed accompaniment or possession. The explanation for these probably is that the fusion is so complete that either case was felt to be natural. The apparently large number of exceptions seen in the genitive does not tell against Hale's theory as the exceptions did against the former theories, for the reason that he is explaining the origin of the construction, admitting that later, in classical prose, both cases were often used indifferently.

The one common expression which absolutely defied classification as possession or accompaniment was *magni preti*. With this exception, which is interesting because it was in use so early, we may fairly say that so far our list of examples corroborates Hale's theory in the statement

of the facts and limitations of the two constructions.

2. Criticism and Discussion of Detailed Statements.

We shall now consider some of the detailed statements found in grammars and elsewhere, with reference to the behavior of certain words or groups of words, and see how far the examples went to prove their truth.

It may be well to state that the assertions concerning *aequus*, *similis*, *dissimilis*, *statura*, *forma*, *corpus*, *genus*, *altitudo*, *magnitudo*, and the parts of the body--as *oculus*, *pes*, *capillus*, *crus*, *coma*--are based on a complete list of examples from Merguet, and concerning *par* the list is complete for Tacitus.

Of these statements the one most obviously incorrect is the one made by Bennett, and Allen and Greenough, to the effect that the adjectives found with the genitive of description are practically limited to the following five: *magnus*, *maximus*, *summus*, *tantus*, *eius*. As there were among the examples, at least 43 different adjectives occurring once or oftener, the unjustifiability of this statement is at once evident.

Lane's rule that *par*, *aequus*, *similis*, and *dissimilis* are always found in the ablative is undoubtedly true, as 27 examples of these adjectives were all in the ablative. Hale's rule that adjectives in --is and *par* are nearly

always in the ablative is true for par, as we have just seen, but of adjectives in --is approximately 25 % were in the genitive.

The general rule that physical qualities and parts of the body are found in the ablative is probably true especially for good classical prose; there were 3 examples of the genitive found, but 2 of these were in poetry and the other in a fragment.

Hale's rule that *statura*, *forma* and *corpus* expressing the idea of kind may be either in the genitive or ablative holds good except for *forma*, as there was one example of *staturae*, one of *corporis*, several ablatives of each, but no genitive of *forma*. Also *modus* is never found in the ablative, and *genus* rarely. The proportion with the genitive being 8:28. Out of these eight 4 denoted ancestry or race, the rest, kind. The reason for this has already been explained, p 10.

Numerical expressions of measure, value, weight, etc., were always in the genitive (8 examples) although curiously enough, the words denoting the same idea, like *altitudo* *magnitudo*, were in the ablative, with the exception of one genitive of *altitudo*.

Mental qualities or characteristics were in the genitive 16 times, in the ablative 42 times, disproving the

statement of one grammar that mental characteristics are oftener in the genitive.

3. Examples from Cicero and Tacitus.

The following examples from Cicero and Tacitus were collected (after Part II of this thesis had been written) for the purpose of finding out the comparative commonness of each construction in these authors. The works of Cicero examined (in Maeller's edition) are: Epist. ad Fam. I-VIII De Officiis, and Cat. I-IV, Archias, Pompey, Marcellus, Tullius, Fonteius, Caecina, Cluentius. The part of Tacitus read was Ann. I-III. The summary of the statistics given below seems to show an increasing use of the genitive as the case of description.

	Speeches	Letters	De Officiis	Total
Genitives (excluding modi)	12	12	11	35
Ablatives	83	46	4	133
modi	47	26	10	83
Total	142	84	25	251

Annals I-III.

Genitives	20
Ablatives	44

Following are the examples:

Ablative\$ of Description from Works of Cicero Mentioned
above.

aequitate: Font 23

aetate: Off. II, 87. Cluent 19.

animo: Fam. I, 5 b, 2, 7, 2.9, 16. II, 1, 2.17, 7. III, 5,
2.6, 3.9, 1.10, 10. IV, 9, 1.13, 7.14, 4.15, 2.
V. 1, 2.2, 10.16, 6. VI, 5, 4.14, 3.18, 1. VII,
3.1. Off I, 65. Caec. 3. Cat. I, 29. Cat. II, 26
Pomp. 11.16. Arch. 15.17. Cluent 10. Tull 18,

aere: Cat. II, 4

au^{tor}toritate: Fam. IV, 2, 2. Font. 23. Caec. 27, Arch. 8.

audacia: Cluent. 8.24.

avo: Cat. I. 4.

capillo: Cat II, 22.

causa: Arch. 31.

commendatione: Cat. I, 28.

condicione: Fam. IV, 3, 2. Cat. IV, 16.

Corpore: Caec. 27.

constantia: Fam. III, 9, 1. Pomp, 68.

continentia: Pomp. 41.

cura: Font 23.

diligentia: Fam. VIII, 6, 3. Arch. 9. Caec. 12. Cluent 16.

doctrina: Fam. III, 7.5

dolore: Fam. VI, 4.4.

egestate: Cluent. 13.
 facilitate: Pomp. 36.
 felicitate: Font. Frag. 9.
 fide: Fam. I, 5, 4. 7, 2. III, 9, 1. Font. 23. 31. Pomp. 36
 Arch. 8. Cluent. 16. Caec. 36.
 foedere: Arch. 6.
 genere: Off. I, 104.
 gloria: Cat. IV, 21.
 humanitate: Pomp. 13. 36. 42.
 gravitate: Pomp. 61.
 ingenio: Fam. IV, 6, 1. Tull 33. Pomp. 36, Arch. 30.
 innocentia: Pomp. 36. 61.
 integritate: Font. 39. Pomp. 68.
 jure: Off III, 67. Pomp. 58. Arch. 6.
 majoribus: Cat. I. 4.
 mente: Fam. I, 9. 4.
 mansuetudine: Pomp. 13.
 nomine: Caec. 36.
 natura: Cluent. 15.
 nequitia: Cluent. 13.
 observantia: Fam. III, 9, 1.
 officio: Fam. VI, 18, 4.
 patre: Cat. I, 4.
 perfidia: Fam. III, 10, 6.

periculo: Fam. VIII, 2, 1.
 pietate: Fam. V, 8, 2. Font. 31.
 prudentia: Fam. III, 7, 5, IV, 2, 2.8, 1. Caec. 12.
 Cluent. 16.
 pudore: Font. 23. Arch. 30. Caec. 36.
 ratione: Cat. III, 11.
 religione: Font. 23, Arch. 8.
 sapientia: Fam. IV, 7, 1.
 scelere: Cluent. 8.
 spe: Fam. I, 7, 11.
 studio: Fam. VI, 22, 3. Font. 23.
 temperantia. Pomp. 13, 36.40.41.
 timore: Font. 23.
 tunicis: Cat. II. 22.
 valetudine: Cluent. 16.
 viribus: Tull. 18.
 vigilantia: Fam. VII. 30, 1.
 virtute: Fam. IV, 6, 1. V. 8, 2. Font. Frag. 9. 31. Pomp.
 61. 68. Caec. 36. Arch. 15.
 usu: Fam. III, 7, 5.

Genitives of Description in the Works of Cicero
 Mentioned Above.

aetatum: Cat. IV, 14.
 animi: Fam. II, 6, 2.6, 4. III, 10, 11. Off. I, 92,
 Arch. 30, Font. 41.

annorum: Cluent. 3.
 benevolentiae: Fam. II, 6, 4.
 constantiae: Fam. II, 6, 4. 16, 3.
 consilii: Fam. III, 10, 11. Font. 41.
 dignitatis: Pomp. 63.
 generis: Fam. I, 7, 1. II, 4, 1. II 8, 5. Off. I, 7, 11
 29, 51. 129. II, 11. III, 24, 32, 43, 50. Caec. 14
 generum: Cat. IV, 14.
 gravitatis: Fam. II, 6, 4.
 ingenii: Caec. 5.
 ordinis: Cluent. 56.
 ordinum: Fam. I, 2, 3. Cat. IV, 14.
 pretii: Tull. 21.

Examples of Modi from works of Cicero Mentioned Above.

Fam. I, 5, 1. 2. 9, 24. III, 8, 5. 10, 8. IV, 4, 5. 4, 4.
 11, 2. 11, 2. 14, 1. V, 2, 1. 2, 10, 3, 1. 5, 3. 6
 1. 8, 1. 10, 1. 10, 1. VI, 4, 1. 4, 3. 18, 4.
 VII, 1, 2. 3. 6. VIII, 3, 3. 10, 3.
 Off. I, 7. 26. 61. 130. 139. III, 30. 30. 33, 50. 67.
 Tull. 11. 14. 18. 32. 35. 40. Font. 48. Caec. 15. 33.
 Cat. I. , 4. III, 25. 26. Pomp. 6. 13. Arch. 3
 31. Marcell. 9. Caec. 14. 23. 25. 25. 32. Clu-
 ent, 13. 15. 15. 18. 20. 31. 39. 58. 19. 24. 25.
 27. 28. 33. 36. 50. 53. 55. 56. 61. 62. 62. 64.
 64. 66. 1.

Ablatives of Description in Tacitus, Ann. I-III.

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Superbia I, 4, 3. | saxis II, 23, 3. |
| impotentia I, 4, 5. | fama II, 34.8 |
| potentia I, 8, 7. | forma II, 39, 3. |
| ornatu I, 9, 6. | aetate II, 39, 3. |
| vocabulo I, 17, 4. | spe II, 45, 3. |
| arte I, 19, 2. | ferocia II, 43, 3. |
| auctoritate I, 24, 3. | pondere II, 57. 5. |
| fecunditate I, 41, 3. | amictu II, 59, 2. |
| pudicitia I, 41, 3. | virtute II, 60, 3. |
| aetate I, 46, 3 | amicitia II, 66, 3. |
| familia I, 53, 4. | corpore II, 71, 1. 73, 3. |
| animo I, 57. 5. | genere II, 73, 3. |
| auctoritate I, 60, 1 | iure II, 73, 4. |
| munere I, 62, 2 | nomine II, 73, 4. |
| uligine I, 64, 2 | matrimonio II, 75, 1 |
| corpore I, 70, 6 | libidine III, 26, 1. |
| venatu II, 2. 5. | severitate III, 52, 1 |
| cura II, 2, 5 | cultu III, 55, 5. |
| cognomento II, 9, 2 | victu III, 55, 5. |
| puppi II, 6, 2 | cognomento III, 71, 1 |
| prora II, 6, 2. | rumore III, 76, 2. |
| utero II, 6, 2. | avo III, 75, 5 |
| patre III, 75, 5. | |

Genitives of Description in Tacitus. Ann. I-III.

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| modi I. 14, 3 | annorum III, 16, 7 |
| ordinis I, 29, 2. | modi III, 29, 2. |
| moris I, 35, 7 | anni III, 58, 3. |
| sexus I, 58, 9 | dierum III, 67, 4 |
| modi II, 30, 1 | ordinis III, 69, 8. |
| ordinis II, 32, 1 | sanctimoniae III, 69, 9. |
| sexus II, 38, 8 | virtutis III, 74, 4 |
| sanguinis II, 43, 6 | nobilitatis III, 76, 5. |
| sexus II, 84, 1 | |
| fastigii II, 84, 2. | |
| generis II, 85, 5. | |
| diei III, 5, 5. | |

Part II.

Modification of Hale's Theory Made Necessary by Study of Early Latin.

For the sake of convenience, all the material from
early Latin is put first; the explanation and discussion of
it follows on pages 30-38.

Genitives of Description in Early Latin.

conveni quendam mei loci atque ordinis Eun. 234.

biduist ant tridui haec sollicitudo And. 440.

nulli consili sum, And. 608

homo paucorum hominum Eun. 409

istuc magnae mellinaest mihi, T^urc. 804. Reading fairly
certain.

magni sunt oneris Most. 782 Reading conjectural.

id esse humani ingeni existumo Most. 814 Reading very
uncertain

generis graecist Merc. 525 Reading very uncertain.

uni animi sumus Stich. 729 Reading doubtful

adulescens escae maxumae Men. 100 Reading certain

homo iracundus animi perditum Men. 269 Reading certain

homo trium litterarum Aul. 325 Reading certain

scio me esse virum imi subcelli Stich. 489 Reading certain

viros ^aLacones imi subselli Capt. 471 Reading fairly certain
 nulli rei erimus Stich. 718 Reading certain
 hominem nullius coloris novi Pseud. 1196 Reading certain
 opus est homine qui cibi minimi et maxuma

industria siet Vid. 42 Reading fairly certain
 instrumenti ne magni siet R. R. 1.5
 videto quam minumi instrumenti agri ne siet R. R. 1.5
 trabeculam pedum XXIII S imposito R. R. 18.5

The following may be genitives but cannot be proven to
 be:

trabes P XXII opus erunt R. R. 189
 fundamenta P II facito R. R. 18,7
 vecetes longissimos P XIIX, secundos P XVI, tertios
 PXV, remissarios P XII alteros P X, Tertios P VIII
 R. R. 19,2.

(The examples of ---preti and ---modi which are really
 descriptive genitives will be given later.)

Ablatives of Description in Early Latin.

aetate: Hec. 737, Adel. 832, And. 72, Amph. 613, Cas. 518,
 Bacc. 1079, 1108, 1163, Merc. 520.

anima: Merc. 574.

Animo: Heut: 438, 665, 821, 912, 963, 122, Hec. 532, 472,
 270, 502, Phor. 957, 965 And. 842, 879, Adel.
 852, 696, 284, 511, 338, 297, Hec. 389, 747, 548

Eun. 84, Rud. 679, 685, M. G. 1143, 1207, Epid.
642 Aul. 732, 787, Bacc. 612, 1015, Pseud. 232,
372, Merc. 531, 890, Amph. 671, 1131, Asin. 639,
726.

argumento: And. 11.

audacia M. G. 464

barba: Bacc. 1101

capillo: Cist. 383

caule: R. R. 157, 1, 2.

capite: Cas. 518, Merc. 305, Asin. 934 Bacc. 1101, Pseud
1240, Amph. 46, curc. 389.

coagmentis: R. R. 18, 9.

colore: Eun. 689, R. R. 109, Rud. 997.

confidentia: Rud. 645.

corio: Rud. 998, Pseud. 229

corpore; Capt 646, Poen 1112

cremore: Pers. 95

crine : Poen 1113

crassitudine: Most. 818

dentibus: Tulrc. 224

ditiis: Capt. 170 Poen. 60

facie: Hec. 441, Phor. 100, Eun. 230, 682, Trin. 903,
Pseud. 724, 1217, Capt. 646, Asin. 353, 399, Rud.
1155, 316, 565, 1149, Pers. 547, Poen. 1111.

factis: Aul. 213

fide: Adel. 441 M. G. 1369, Bacc. 542

forma: And 123, 428, 119, 72, Eun. 132, 366, Heaut. 523,
Stich. 380, Men. 18, Merc. 405, 5, 414, 638, 9,
210, 260, Amph. 613 Epid. 43, M. G. 10, 967
Pers. 521, 130, Rud. 894, 1306.

fronte: Rud. 318, Asin. 400

foliis: R. R. 157, 1

genere: Poen. 60, Pers. 651, M. G. 680, Trin. 326, 851,
Cist. 130, Aul. 554

gloria: Bacc. 26

gradibus: Epid. 13

honore Capt. 279

ingenio: Capt. 401, Poen. 1185, Most. 206, 396, Bacc. 454,
Merc. 970, Stich. 116, Asin. 944, Truc. 779,
And. 487, Hec. 164, 489, Phor. 497, Eun. 880,
Adel. 297, Curc. 146.

industria: Vid. 42

largatatione: Heauton. 441

malis: Merc. 640, Asin. 400

matre: Epid. 641

moribus: Trin. 283, 1045, Capt. 105, Stich. 105, Curc.

146, Trin. 825, Truc. 5.

naso: Capt. 646

natura: R. R. 157, 2.
 nomine: Capt. 288, Men. 1122
 oculis: Capt. 646, Poen. 1113, Bacc. 1015, Pseud. 1220,
 Asin. 400, Merc. 640.
 opere: Cas. 21
 ore: Phor. 625, Capt. 646, Pseud. 1220
 ornatu: M. G. 897
 pallio: Capt. 789
 parsimonia: Heaut. 441
 patre: Epid. 641
 pectore: Eun. 314, Asin. 944
 pedibus: Adel. 585, Epid. 627, Pseud. 1220, Merc. 595
 pediculo: R. R. 8, 1
 prosapia: Merc. 634
 pulchritudine: M. G. 998
 ratione: And. 11 Phor. 5
 sententia: Hec. 312
 scriptura: Phor. 5
 statura: Pers. 698, Poen. 1112, Asin. 400
 spe: Rud. 275
 specie: Rud. 415, Pers. 546, Bacc. 839, Poen. 1113
 studio: Adel. 41
 spectu: R. R. 157, 2
 sumptu: Aul. 484

superciliis: Rud. 318
 umeris: Eun. 314
 voce: Most. 576
 ungulis: Pseud 852
 veste: Eun. 820
 vi: Truc. 5
 vino : R. R. 1, 6 (twice)
 virtute: Adel. 441
 voltu: And. 119, Most. 811
 vorsibus: Amph. 54

Genitives of Value in Early Latin.

pluris: attrib: Men. 680
 with refert: Bacc. 518, Pseud. 102
 with sum: Merc. 514, Truc. 490
 with facio: Trin. 34 Curc. 580
 trioboli: attrib: Poen. 381, 463.
 nauci: attrib: Truc. 611, with sum: Most. 1041
 nihili: attrib: Merc. 125, M. G. 285, 180, Trin. 1017
 Cas. 559, 239, 245, Pers. 120, Rud. 920, Assin.
 472, 203, Truc. 333, 942, 695.
 nihili with facio: Merc. 440, Curc. 155, 218, Pers.
 224 M. G. 168 Cas. 605, Trin. 1032 Bacc. 89,
 Pseud. 1087, 1103, 1104, Adel. 167.

nihili with sum: Truc. 554 Cist. 238 Pers. 94, 96,
179, Most. 156 Cas. 119 Bacc. 90 1157, 1156, 1
1162, 1207, Pseud. 239, Men. 972.

nihili with pendere: Most. 245, Trin. 607, Poen. 520
Eun. 94.

quanti with pendo: Truc. 398, Heaut. 155
with facio: Amph. 508 Bacc. 1135
with sum: Bacc. 820 Capt. 145 Eun. 791
with emo: Merc. 514, 221 Epid. 295, 51 Poen.
897 Pseud. 1170 Rud. 1405 Most. 822 And. 249
Eun. 984 Eun. 75 R. R. 146, 1
with refert: Pseud. 1086 Rud. 965 Heaut. 467
copuinare: Psaud, 875
conduco: Pseud. 1184 R. R. 144, 3
Censeo: Rud. 1272
destino: Most. 646
iudico: Pers. 575
sumo: Adel. 977

tanti with facere: Merc. 16
with emo: Merc. 489
with est: Merc. 315 Bacc. 820

minioris with vendere: Merc. 425
with facio: Epid. 522, 662, Most. 1146
with pendere: Most. 215, Most. 884

- parvi with facio: Aul, 112, Rud. 697
 with pendo: Bacc. 558, Trin. 102 Rud. 650 Hec.
 513, And. 526, Heaut. 715.
 with sum: Pers. 690
- flocci with facio: Men. 994, 423, Epid. 348, Most. 808,
 Stich. 285, Trin. 918, 992, 211, Cas. 332,
 Curc. 714 Truc. 606, Rud. 782, 795, 47,
 Eun. 303
 with pendere: Eun. 412
 with existimo: Pers. 353, Most 76
- Maximi with facio: Cas. 2, And 574, 293
- magni with facio: Pseud. 579, Asin. 114, 407, Cist. 21
 Adel. 879.
 with pendo: Pseud. 221, Stich. 135, Curc. 262, A
 Asin. 460.
 with refert: M. G. 882 Phor. 723, 800.
- minimi with facio: Pseud. 269
- aequi istuc facio: M. G. 784
- aequi bonique dixeris: Phor. 637
- terunci facio: Capt. 477
- huius with facio: Adel 163

Examples of preti: (which are really genitives of description.)

Examples of preti:

Predicative: videtur esse quantivis preti, And. 856

neque preti maioris habet, Heaut. 64

deputat erus meam operam parvi preti, Hec. 799

te esse hominem maxumi preti iudicavi, Adel. 891

parvi preti sit, Trin. 257

est tam parvi preti, Aul. 790

scio illum (esse) minimi preti, Asin. 858

nomen atque omen quantivis est preti, Pers. 625

me emunxisti mucidum minimi preti, Epid. 494

fateor me omnium hominum esse minimi preti, Epid 503

mortuos pluris pretist quam ego sum, Bacc. 630

Attributive: Vir minimi preti, Trin. 925

quid ais, vir minimi preti? Cas. 594

quid in urbe reptas, velice haud magni preti? Cas. 98

homo haud magni preti, Curc. 167

flagitium hominis; subdole ac minumi preti, Men. 489

senex minumi preti, Bacc. 444

ne tu h^abes servom graphicum et quantivis preti,

Epid, 410

est homo haud magni preti, M. G. 145

Examples of modi: (which should perhaps be listed as
genitives of description.)

huismi: Poen. 1273, Amph. 938, 941, Pseud. 823, Bacc. 676

66, Capt. 1033, Trin. 795, M. G. 1023, Poen. 824
 Heaut. 339, 812, Eun. 873, Phor. 505, 529, R. R.
 157.4 (twice), 157.5 (twice) Eun. 746.
 illius modi: R. R. 157, 2, Adel. 441
 eius modi: And. 93, Rud. 127, Trin. 337, Phor. 821
 istiusmodi: Heaut. 387, Rud. 321, Most. 746, Trin. 552,
 Merc. 144, 166, Epid. 119,
 isti modi: Truc. 930
 quoi quoi modi: Bacc. 400
 quousmodi: Rud. 83, 422, 424, Pers. 386, 648, Most. 642,
 817, 1117, 818, 908, Pseud. 741, Men. 221, Men. 575
 cuiusmodi: R. R. 157, 1.

2. Hale's Theory in the Light of These Examples.

As explained earlier in this paper the sources given by Prof. Hale for the genitive of description were the explanatory genitives like "a delay of five days," and the possessive genitive in phrases like "eius generis," "eius modi." If this were true, we should naturally expect to find these two types of expressions in comparatively common use in early Latin. To ascertain whether or not this was the case, the above list of examples of the genitive and ablative of description and of the (so-called) genitive of value was gathered from the works of Plautus, Terence and Cato.

The list is believed to be complete, but the examples were collected from only one reading. The texts used were Ritschel's Plautus, Dziatzko's Terence, and Keil's Cato.

Following is a summary of the statistics:

| | Plautus | Ter-
ence | Cato | Total |
|---|---------|--------------|------|-------|
| Genitives of description
(excluding modi, preti) | 13 | 6 | 3 | 22 |
| Modi | 33 | 11 | 6 | 50 |
| Preti | 15 | 4 | | 19 |
| Ablatives of description | 143 | 61 | 11 | 215 |
| Genitives of value | 117 | 20 | 2 | 139 |
| Total | 321 | 103 | 22 | 445 |

Note: Nouns only were counted in enumerating the genitives and ablatives of description, e.g. "animo liquido et tranquillo est." Epid. 642, is counted as one example; but when two nouns occur as in "antiqua virtute ac fide," Adel 441, both are counted.

A study of the ablatives of description given on pages 23-26 will show that they support Prof. Hale's theory as to the origin of the construction. In comparison with the genitives as to numbers they also add weight to his objections to the theory which bases the difference between cases on permanent and transitory qualities; for if this was the fundamental difference originally, in Plautus' time the Romans had practically only transitory qualities. Furthermore there were many nouns used in the genitive found among

the examples used in Part I of this paper, that were used only in the ablative in early Latin; and by a comparison of the following ablatives which occurred in early Latin with the same nouns occurring in both genitive and ablative in Cicero and Tacitus, or in one case and not in the other as the case may be, it will be seen that the lack of descriptive genitives in early Latin is not due to a failure to use these nouns in a descriptive construction, but rather to the fact that the genitive had not yet become a common descriptive case. The statistics for the nouns in Cicero are based on Merguet; those in Tacitus, on Gerber and Greef.

| | Abl.
in
early
Latin | Gen.
in
early
Latin | Abl.
in
Cicero | Gen.
in
Cicero | Abl.
in
Tacitus | Gen.
in
Tacitus |
|-----------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| aetas | 9 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 18 | 4 |
| anima | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| animus | 42 | 2 | 75 | 16 | 6 | 2 |
| argumento | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| audacia | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| barba | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| capillus | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| caulis | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| caput | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| coagmenta | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | Abl.
in
ear-
ly
Latin | Gen.
in
ear-
ly
Latin | Abl.
in
Cic-
ero | Gen.
in
Cic-
ero | Abl.
in
Tac-
itus | Gen.
in
Tac-
itus |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| color | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| confidentia | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| corium | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| corpus | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| cremor | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| crinis | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| crassitudo | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| dentes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ditia | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| facies | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| facta | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| fides | 3 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| forma | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| frons | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| folia | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| genus | 7 | 1 | 5 | 56 | 2 | 3 |
| gloria | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| gradus | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| honor | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| ingenium | 16 | 1 | 33 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| industria | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| largitatio | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| malus | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | Abl.
in
ear-
ly
Latin | Gen.
in
ear-
ly
Latin | Abl.
in
Cic-
ero | Gen.
in
Cic-
ero | Abl.
in
Tac-
itus | Gen.
in
Tac-
itus |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| mater | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| mos | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| nasus | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| natura | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| nomen | 2 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| oculus | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| opus | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| os | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ornatus | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| pallium | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| parsimonia | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| pater | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| pectus | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| pes | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| pediculum | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| prosopia | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| pulchritudo | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ratio | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| sententia | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| scriptura | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| statura | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| spes | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| | Abl.
in
ear-
ly
Latin | Gen.
in
ear-
ly
Latin | Abl.
in
Cic-
ero | Gen.
in
Cic-
ero | Abl.
in
Tac-
itus | Gen.
in
Tac-
itus |
|------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| species | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| studium | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| spectus | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| sumptus | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| supercilia | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| umerum | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| vox | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ungula | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| vestis | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| vis | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| vino | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| virtus | 1 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| vultus | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| versus | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 218 | 4 | 241 | 91 | 53 | 14 |

The scarcity of examples of most of these nouns used in a descriptive construction in the three periods gives less favorable evidence for the change in the construction than might be wished for; but on the whole it will be seen that those words which retained a preference for the ablative were those that would naturally be expected to do so, in accordance with Prof. Hale's theory, especially the words

denoting parts of the body and physical characteristics; while the genitives that do occur are to be explained by an extension of the construction, as will be pointed out later, the great increase of examples of "generis" being probably due to the analogy of "eius modi" which was in such common use in the early period. The noun "pes" in the genitive expressed measure, in the ablative, parts of the body. The increase in percentage of genitives shows, for these words at least, a gradual tendency to use this as a descriptive case more and more (the apparent decrease from Cicero to Tacitus being due to the large number of examples of generis, mentioned above).

But as for the general sources which Prof. Hale gives for the genitive, the following considerations tend to show that as such they were insufficient to bring about the later construction. In the first place, the type of explanatory genitive seen in "homo trium litterarum", Aul. 325, was very rare in Plautus and Terence; but in Cato, if such expressions as "fundamenta P II faciat" be genitive, it seems to have been in common use. The explanation for the rarity of this construction in early Latin is probably not that it was not in existence in the language, but that Plautus and Terence seldom had occasion to express such an idea and that the manuscripts of Cato abbreviated the nouns

pedum, etc. At any rate, we can say that it was not the construction as a whole, (which includes examples like "urbs Romae") that contributed to the genitive of description, but only such typical numerical expressions as are seen in Cato's "trabeculam pedum XXIII" R.R. 18,5. They are themselves a direct development of the explanatory genitive, and contain no elements of fusion.

Secondly, the possessive genitive seems to have influenced the genitive of description through only one, and that a very common expression, namely, "eius modi." Granting that this was a genitive of possession, as it must have been if the original meaning was "kind" (although Roby suggests that it may have been a locative), the other genitive of possession which Prof. Hale cites, namely "eius generis" is too rare in early Latin to justify his giving it as a source for the descriptive genitive. It occurs only once, and then in a passage where the manuscripts are corrupt. On the other hand, the ablative genere is found in a number of places where generis would have been expected. Much more probable is it that "eius generis" came in after an analogy with the phrase "eius modi" which was in such common use, and which alone, instead of the possessive genitive as a construction, contributed to the genitive of description.

Thirdly, the rather frequently occurring expression "magni preti" can not have come from either the possessive or the explanatory genitive. But it is clearly a descriptive genitive, especially when used attributively; when used predicatively it seems to perform the functions of both a genitive of description and a genitive of value. This last point is important, and will be used later, in discussing the genitive of value. The next section will be devoted to a discussion of the latter construction, which nearly all the grammars give as a development from the genitive of description.

3. Genitive of Value as Locative, according to Roby.

In view of the difficulty in referring the genitives of description found in the early authors to the sources which Prof. Hale proposes, let us examine another construction, viz. ^{the} Genitives of value, which was in universal use in early times, as seen by the large number of instances in the table on page ³¹ ~~119~~. In Hale and nearly all other grammars this genitive of value is explained as a development from the genitive of description. But the abundance of examples, compared with an almost total absence of genitives of description is a strong argument against this theory. We should expect to find the conditions reversed. Is it not possible that the so-called genitive of value

was locative in its origin? With this question in mind, the construction was examined in all the standard grammars enumerated above, and in addition Dräger, Kühner, Delbrück (Vergleichende Syntax) and Roby. All except the last referred the construction either to the genitive of description as did Hale, or placed it vaguely under the heading "Genitive with Verbs." Roby, however, sees in the forms *tanti*, *magni*, etc., a locative form. His reasons given in summary are as follows:

"1. The form is quite right, with the exception of the comparatives like *pluris*, *minoris*, but these are known to have been to some extent usurpers.

"2. The locative is, like the forms under discussion, regularly dependent on verbs, not on nouns.

"3. There is a similar interchange of these forms in *-i* with the ablative in questions of amount, to that which is found between the locative and ablative in expressions of place where and time where. There is also some interchange with adverbs, e.g. "*care venaunt*." Varr R.R. 3 5 2 "*vilissime constare*" Cat. ap. Plin. 18 844; and *magni*, *pluris*, *multum*, *plus magis*, *maxime* all occur with *refert* and *interest*.

"4. The meaning of the case seems to be precisely suitable. Value is naturally figured to the imagination

by place on a scale . Compare English: "at Rome," "at twelve o'clock" "at so much" "at a high price."

It will be seen from the above that Roby is aware that there is a confusion between the locative forms and the genitive forms. To show the intermixture of the two cases, he quotes Madvig: "(1) Cost and price may be expressed by the genitive of tantus, quantus, and the comparatives; by the ablative of nihilum, tantulum and of the positives and comparatives. (2) Value is expressed by either the ablative or genitive after aestimo, but after other verbs (duco, facio, habeo, peudo, puto, taxo, sum) by the genitive only; and that in the language of everyday life after verbs of valuing (with a negative) flocci, nauci, assis, (unius assis) teruncii, huius occur. Such a result, Roby says, must have been due to some confusion or false analogy.

"The only words which are shown by their form to be genitive as distinguished from the locative are pluris, minoris, majoris, huius, assis, decussis, centussis, sextantis. Of these, pluris, minoris, assis, alone occur more than once, and pluris and minoris alone occur before Terence. The only use of the genitive is therefore certainly old, but it is not found in many words in the early language. Yet Latin was spoken for hundreds of years before Naevius, and simple expressions of value must have been at

among the earliest subjects of conversation. And there was every circumstance to make people think tanti and magni to be the genitive, and thus to give rise by a false analogy to pluris and minoris. The forms of the genitive and locative were exactly alike both in -o stems and -a stems. Hence if the case really was the locative some such use as that of pluris and minoris might very probably have arisen from the specious appearance of analogy. The existence of such true genitives in this sense is not therefore a fatal objection to the supposition that the original case was the locative."

In addition to these considerations, Roby points to the general habit of the cases to show the improbability that the use belonged originally to the genitive.

"1. Tanti, magni, etc. qualify verbs, not substantives. Nihili seems to be the only word of this class which is used more than once and, except trioboli in Plaut. Poen I 2 168, the only word used at all, with a substantive. Now the genitive above all other cases has the habit of depending on a noun, or if on a verb, on some noun notion in the verb.

(As appeared in the list of examples there are more examples than Roby found, though not enough to affect his arguments.)

"2. The genitive of description has two characteristics. It is almost always dependent on a substantive and itself shows a combination of adjective and substantive. If tanti be taken to be a substantivally used adjective it fails to exhibit either of the two characteristics. If we adopt the only other course, that of supposing the full form to have been tanti preti, we must concede what should never be conceded without reluctance, an almost perpetual ellipse (of preti.)

"3. These simple quantitative adjectives used substantivally are a class not found in the genitive, (at least in other uses) nor in the dative, the case which is perhaps the nearest akin to the genitive, but found frequently in the adverbial accusative and the ablative, which are cases standing nearest the locative."

In Roby's opinion the confusion in actual use arose probably thus: "The forms in -i denoted value; the ablative denoted price (as a means). The forms in -i became naturally applied to price and only by accident became in this use restricted to tanti and quanti. The use of the ablative was extended to express value after aestimo, perhaps through some original meaning of that word, and was excluded accidentally from tantus and quantus."

Roby's remarks have been given in detail, both because

they are interesting and very closely connected with our present subject, and also because, so far as we know, he stands practically alone in his belief concerning this construction. In spite of these arguments grammarians seem to have rejected Roby's theory. If the so called genitives of value were originally locatives, or came in after an analogy with locatives, it is plain that no one can be justified in deriving the construction from the genitive of description. Yet the grammars generally give this derivation. But the scarcity of genitives of description in comparison with the very free use of the genitive of value, makes this derivation very improbable. Even if no independent origin for the genitive of value could be found it would nevertheless appear more likely that it preceded the descriptive and served as a source for it. As Roby's theory seems not improbable in itself, and furnishes the desired independent source of the genitive of value, it is accepted here. The probable manner in which the genitive of value served as a source for the descriptive genitive has already been hinted at, namely, through the expression "magni pretii". As shown on page 38 this expression is always descriptive when attributive; but when predicative, seems to denote both value and description. The following is probably what took place: At first the genitive of value, magni,

for instance, was used predicatively with a verb implying the idea of value (*existumo*); when, possibly after analogy with *modi*, etc., the genitive of value was used attributively (*homo magni*), a noun was needed to express the idea of value formerly expressed by the verb. Therefore *preti* was added (*homo magni preti*). In turn, after this expression became fixed, it crossed back to the predicative position and denoted value (*homo est magni preti*). *Nihili*; which is equivalent to *nullius preti*, was right on the border line between value and description. The beginning of the genitive of description coming from the genitive of value as a source may then be said to have been the circumstance described above; namely, the genitive of value became attributive and took the noun *preti* to express the idea of value formerly expressed by the verb. If we may judge from the number of examples, this source probably exercised more influence over the genitive of description than did the two proposed by Prof. Hale.

4. Results.

The material presented in this paper has at least opened up the question under discussion; it has shown a great disagreement among the grammars, has vindicated a part of Prof. Hale's theory, and has shown possible explanations for points on which his theory is incomplete. Stated more definitely it has given the following results:

1. It has shown the great scarcity of the genitive of description (aside from *modi* and *preti*) in Plautus, Terence, and Cato.

2. It has made it probable that the sources given for the construction by Prof. Hale are insufficient to account for the few genitives there are.

3. Instead of the two general influences given by Prof. Hale it is more probable that there were three specific influences that gave rise to the genitive of description: (a) The special type of explanatory genitive seen in numerical expressions; (b) the special type of possessive genitive, *eius modi*; (c) the genitive of value acting through the expression *magni preti*. And the third of these influences was probably greater than the other two.

4. In view of the small number of genitives of des-

cription it would seem incorrect to derive from this construction the genitive of value, which occurred so frequently.

5. This last point also adds more weight to Roby's theory that the so-called genitive of value was originally a locative.

6. Additional reason has been given for disbelieving the theory that the difference between the cases is based on permanent and transitory qualities.

University of Kansas Libraries



3 3838 100531034